

# CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Abbreviations	3

## **Individual and State in the Production of Athenian Public Monuments**

Introduction	4
Stage 1: Who cares about the individual?	6
Stage 2: Controlling the individual: the position of the State	10
Conclusion: Producing a (Monumental) Thesis	14
Bibliography	17

4900 words

**Front cover:** 'Berlin Foundry Cup': Red figure kylix attributed to the Foundry Painter, 490-480 BC (side B).  
Source: *Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin*

## Acknowledgements

This work was carried out at the Faculty of Classics, Cambridge University and at the British School at Athens, funded by the AHRB. I am grateful to all three parties for enabling me to complete it.

I would like to thank my supervisor Robin Osborne for always being on hand to help. Many useful comments and suggestions came from Julia Shear, Polly Low and Henry Hurst. I offer my sincerest thanks to the Library staff for putting up with my endless queries and to the staff of the Sidgwick site buttry for being there when it was all too much. Finally I would like to thank the M.Phil seminar group for making the year so much fun.

## Abbreviations

AC	<i>Antiquité Classique</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
Arch Zeit	<i>Archäologische Zeitung</i>
BCH	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique</i>
CAJ	<i>Cambridge Archaeological Journal</i>
CA	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
Hellman	Hellmann M. C. <i>Choix d'inscriptions architecturales grecques</i> , , Lyon 1999
HMA	Hill G.F. <i>Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars</i> , OUP 1951
HM	<i>Aelian Historical Miscellany</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JOEAI	<i>Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts</i>
LP	Plutarch <i>Life of Pericles</i>
LC	Plutarch <i>Life of Cato</i>
LX	Plutarch <i>Life of Ten Orators</i>
ME	Plutarch <i>Moral Essays</i>
NH	Pliny <i>Natural History</i>
PCPS	<i>Proceedings of Cambridge Philological Society</i>
REG	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

# INDIVIDUAL AND STATE IN THE PRODUCTION OF ATHENIAN PUBLIC MONUMENTS

## Introduction

Monuments<sup>1</sup> express, create and mould political identity and civic space.<sup>2</sup> They ‘perform’ roles in constructing Athens’ identity.<sup>3</sup> The focus of this essay will be on how their parts were written.

How did monuments end up looking as they did? In searching for *the* impetus for design,<sup>4</sup> scholars have focused on the complex relationship between the craftsmen and the state – the two energies through which a monument comes into being – and on finding who had the greater say in the design process. Did the individual lead the state or vice versa?<sup>5</sup> Who can lay claim to ‘own’ the monument?

Such a framing of the question reflects the agonistic relationship normally presupposed between these two entities (the individual *v.* the state).<sup>6</sup> Such a way of looking at the relationship between these two does not offer us much scope for understanding its complexity. This essay tries to get at that complexity by examining how public initiative and individual impetus interrelated in practice in the production of public monuments.

---

<sup>1</sup> What is a monument? “Very different objects, such as temples, statues, banks, libraries and sports fields can become monuments of respective communities”. Hölscher 1998.156. I take such a wide view in this essay. See also Stähler 1992, 1993; Stewart 1990.89-92; Mai 1989; Hölscher 1974.

<sup>2</sup> See Castriota 1992.6,8,16,316; 1991.371; Hölscher 1998.181-2; Boardman 1985; Cook 1987; Connor 1970; Shapiro 1989. The notion was specifically recognised in Antiquity: see Plutarch *LP* 12.1-13.8; Thucydides 1.10.2.

<sup>3</sup> Goldhill and Osborne 1999.

<sup>4</sup> For example the beauty contest (Spivey 1996), or the creation of aesthetic criteria and vocabulary from medicine (Tanner 2000, Métraux 1995) as impeti for the design of statues.

<sup>5</sup> Such a question locates itself in the more general debate over the position of craftsmen in the ancient world, which falls into two camps: those who think of them as individual “artistic creators” (e.g. Stewart 1979) and those who see them as a largely anonymous social group (e.g. Ridgway 1997).

<sup>6</sup> Following the notion of the ‘agon mentality’ of the Greek World - see Lloyd 1990.

First: the individual. Later written sources, and much modern scholarship, have highlighted the role of the individual not only in the design process, but in the story of 'Art' as a whole (to which these monuments are said to belong). I shall compare this view to that given by the contemporary literary and epigraphic sources: focusing on one individual that we might expect to be heavily involved in the design of public monuments – the *architekton*. I shall argue that, while the *architekton* is heavily involved in supervising the execution of monuments, he is not involved to any great extent in their design. In contrast I shall highlight particular cases where the state does appear to give named individuals (who are never given an official title) free rein with design.<sup>7</sup> Such fragmentation of design and execution prevents any one individual from laying claim to own the monument.

Second: the state. When talking about the 'state' in relation to Athens, I am referring to the different bodies that made up the apparatus of government – in particular the *Boule* and the *Ekklesia*. These groups could (choose to) exercise control over individuals in the production process in two ways. Firstly, many designs were chosen through a competitive process initiated and judged by the state. Secondly these bodies could enforce limits on the duration and amount of work that any individual could undertake, denying them any degree of 'ownership' over public monuments. Yet the regular change over of citizens serving within the *Boule* and the sheer number in the *Ekklesia* also prevents these bodies from claiming to own these monuments.

In conclusion, I hope to argue that there is no fixed ratio of individual to state in the recipe for the production of monuments and that the relationship between the two was extremely flexible. Such flexibility means that these monuments cannot be labelled simply as showcases of the individual or as elements of a 'top down', well-rehearsed state propaganda campaign. Instead I would argue that the dynamic dialogue of individual and state, inherent in the manufacturing process, transfers the emphasis for their ownership onto the people of Athens, thus making these monuments a fundamental part of Athenian public identity.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Following Schweitzer 1932.

<sup>8</sup> Hölscher 1998; Boedeker and Raaflaub 1998.333/4.

## Stage 1: Who cares about the Individual?

Later written sources<sup>9</sup> such as Pliny, Plutarch and Pausanias, give the impression that the individual craftsman is of paramount importance in the creation of monuments that are primarily works of ‘art’ rather than part of a social fabric. For them the individual (artist) is king.<sup>10</sup> Much of the scholarship on art and its ‘Artists’ has taken its lead from such writers: modern scholars have liked their histories to be “peppered with genius”.<sup>11</sup> In an attempt to tell *the* Story of Art (not least motivated by the perceived need to carve out a niche for themselves within Classics), they have very purposely put monuments into their own realm.<sup>12</sup> They understand the process of production to be entirely motivated by factors that relate only to the individual.<sup>13</sup>

Does the epigraphic evidence support this spotlight on the individual? To answer this I shall examine several inscriptions that establish the responsibilities of one individual who is involved with the production of public monuments: the *architekton*.

In IG I<sup>3</sup> 474 (409/8BC) – the building accounts of the Erechtheum - the *architekton* is named in line 2 as Philokles Acharneus. This is not the name that is traditionally associated with the design of the Erechtheum (it is usually Kallikrates or Mnesicles).<sup>14</sup> Scholars have commented that the term *architekton* often denotes not the designer but a supervisor of the building process.<sup>15</sup> Yet in this inscription, the name of the designer is *never* mentioned. We have an

---

<sup>9</sup> Their very date raises difficulties about reading back to fifth and fourth centuries practices: see Pollitt 1990.

<sup>10</sup> Pliny’s tales are often artist/sculptor led, and Pausanias likes telling stories associated with a particular statue: Pollitt 1990.8 and 1974. See also the many anecdotes of times when the artist knows better than the people what they want – Praxiteles in Pliny *NH* 36.20; Polyclitus in Aelian *HM* 14.8.

<sup>11</sup> Spivey 1996.160. E.g. Stewart 1979 and Osborne 1998, whose framing trope is the arrival of the Artist.

<sup>12</sup> See Moreland 2001.32 who talks about the purposeful fragmentation of approaches between archaeology and text. You can approach monuments as Art, or as politics, but not, until recently, as both.

<sup>13</sup> Berenson: “the absurdity so current in romantic art history, of taking it for granted that it was the painter or sculptor who was responsible for the subject matter of his work.” 1954.254.

<sup>14</sup> See Shear 1963 for Kallikrates and Dörpfeld 1904 for Mnesicles.

<sup>15</sup> As Gros calls them “master carpenters” 1983.450. See also Coulton 1977.

*architekton* but no architect!<sup>16</sup> Moreover IG I<sup>3</sup> 476 (408/7BC), the accounts for the following year, announces a different *architekton* - Archilochus (lines 1/2), who seems to have replaced Philokles.

What is going on in these two decrees? The decrees detail who is being paid for working on the Erechtheum but do not include payment for anyone responsible for designing the building – only to the *architekton*, who changes, it seems, every year, and who looks after its construction (and deals with unforeseen design problems as they arise on the ground).<sup>17</sup> This very clear demarcation between the role of *architekton* and architect must I think also be what is happening at the Temple of Asklepius at Epidaurus (IG IV<sup>2</sup> 102 (Fourth century)). Burford has argued that Theodotus, the *architekton*, is also the principle designer on the basis that an architect is not mentioned.<sup>18</sup> However in the light of the Erechtheum decrees we can see that such a link is not a foregone conclusion. Indeed it is much more likely that Theodotus is only the *architekton*, and indeed he is paid in the same way as Archilochus was in the Erechtheum decree (compare line 9 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 102 with line 256 IG I<sup>3</sup> 476).

Again in the fourth century we can see evidence for the *architekton* as the supervisor rather than as the architect. In IG II<sup>2</sup> 244 (337/6 BC) and IG II<sup>2</sup> 463 (307/6BC) – both decrees about the restoration of the Long walls – *tois architektosi* are being paid a regular salary by the *demos* (most probably they are all working on different sections of the wall).<sup>19</sup> Again in the Fourth century, Hellmann 6.1.21-38 (311BC) – a decree for connecting the old and new parts of the town of Colophon by joining the outer walls – chooses, through examination, an *architekton* “who will be most capable to take care of (*epimelesthai*) the work (lines 23-4).<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> These decrees do deal with a late stage in the building process and so may not need to record a payment to the designer, which has already been made. However the *complete* absence of any reference to him or his design still requires explanation.

<sup>17</sup> Such as the West Wall – see Weller 1921.

<sup>18</sup> Burford 1969.138-45.

<sup>19</sup> See Martin 1983.450 and Plutarch *LP* 13.5.

<sup>20</sup> Compare also the construction of the Temple of Apollo at Didyma where Voigtländer thinks the *architekton* had no role in conception: 1975.144ff.

So, if the *architekton* is supervising the projects, who is designing them and how are they chosen? *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1668* (347BC) – the contract for Philo’s Arsenal in Piraeus – offers some answers. In this decree the design (*suggraphe*) has already been chosen and is attributed to “Demetrios and Philo” (lines 2-3).<sup>21</sup> These two seem to be different from the *architekton* because line 94 notes that there will be a (singular) *architekton* (who is not named) who will explain the model and the measurements to *oi misthosamenoι* (the ones who actually do the work). This naming of the individual is again seen in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 79* (422BC) – the building of a bridge on the processional road from Athens to Eleusis – where the decree spells out the design it has chosen (lines 5-15) and in 16-7 notes that these specifications are in accordance with the design agreed with Demomeles (his title *architekton* here is a complete restoration). Thus decrees occasionally name designers, though without giving them an official title, and without giving an explanation as to how they were chosen.

Indeed sometimes the decree makes clear that an individual has been chosen without any designs having yet been seen. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 35* (450BC) — the Nike Temple Decree — makes it clear that the building design and execution is a *Boule*-led process<sup>22</sup> (line 2, 17-18). However it also says that the “specifications for the doors are to be set out (*chsuggraphsei*) by Kallikrates”.<sup>23</sup> At this stage there is no indication that any designs have actually been presented by him (note the future tense of *chsuggraphsei*). The assembly votes on an individual rather than a design. Indeed the assembly seems to realise how much of a *carte blanche* they have offered and votes a rider to the decree specifying that three men from the *Boule* are to be chosen to help him draw up the specifications.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> And indeed the decree becomes a description of their design: it is itself a “*suggraphe*” and describes itself as such – lines 1 and 95. *Suggraphai* are also laid out in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1666* A34,48,82,B4; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1665.1.4*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1678* (Delos 350 BC); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1675* (Eleusis); Hellmann 9 1.7/8. Sometimes the *suggraphai* would be very specific: calling for specific shaped stones eg. Ionic cornice in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1666* A28, B9. Designs are also referred to by authors as *paradeigmata*: see *Ath Pol* 49.2 and Herodotus 5.62: *paradeigmata* for the Alkmaionid Temple of Apollo in Delphi.

<sup>22</sup> See Boersma 1970. However the *Boule* also staff it out to smaller committees – see in this decree line 8/9: “The *poletai* are to let out the contract”. In addition see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 206.66-7* – where the *poletai* make the contract, but do not supervise the work.

<sup>23</sup> Lines 7/8. Translation taken from Mark 1993.105. Kallikrates is also to design specifications for a temple and an altar (lines 12-13). For other examples of the use of the term *chsuggraphai* see *IG I<sup>3</sup> 45.6* and 79.16.

<sup>24</sup> Lines 15-18. It is very unusual for the process to be so explicitly spelt out. For explanations see Mattingly 1982.385 and Bundgård 1976.169. For more comment see Mark 1993.104.

How do these designers come to be chosen? In *IG II<sup>2</sup> 244* (337/6BC), which we met above, *suggraphai* are called for from “from anyone who wants to make them” (line 5). These entries must be judged, an example of which is *IG I<sup>3</sup> 64A* (440-415BC) - a project involved with the Nike Temple. The project is announced and a contest is initiated where people are asked to submit *graphsanta*<sup>25</sup> to the *epistatai*<sup>26</sup> (a board of the *Boule*), which will be voted on at the later stage by the *Ekklesia*. The decree also stipulates the type and value of materials that can be used in the design.<sup>27</sup>

Thus we can see that the *architekton* was heavily involved in supervising the execution of a project, rather than its design. Who designed these projects, and what freedom they had to do so is more difficult to establish. On some decrees, individuals are named in the decrees after their designs have been chosen or before they are even submitted. Yet in nearly all these decrees, there is no indication that the designers (if indeed they are mentioned) had any long-term control (any ‘ownership’) over their designs — indeed the introduction of the *architekton*, as the supervisor to take care of the work in place of the architect, actively limits such ownership. Thus it could be said that it is the sheer number of individuals involved by the state in the different stages of production that stops any one from claiming ownership over the end product.<sup>28</sup>

## Stage 2: Controlling the individual: the position of the State

---

<sup>25</sup> How did the designer present his design? Coulton argues that architectural conventions made drawings unnecessary: “it is possible to have planning without plans and a process of design without design drawings.” 1983.466-68. See Bungaard 1957 and Benndorf 1902. No archaeological evidence for scale models exists. There seems only to have been the written description: *suggraphe* or *suggkriseis*. For a competition with *suggkriseis* see Hellmann 2.9 (*SEG* 33 1640).

<sup>26</sup> *epistatai* as board that worked specifically with architect/craftsmen to design monuments: see this decree line 17, also *IG I<sup>3</sup> 459*; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 474*; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 472* and *SEG 37 89*. This board were financially controlled - their accounts were publicly examined by the *logistae* - see *IG I<sup>3</sup> 433*. They could have been chosen from the *Boule* or elected by the *Demos* (see *HMA* 41.7-13). Rhodes (1972) thinks of this as a fledgling public works department. Sometimes however the contract was managed from within the *dikasterion* (Rhodes 1972): *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1669.8,21* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1678.27-8*.

<sup>27</sup> Lines 2-5. See for comparison *IG I<sup>3</sup> 64B* (stipulates the amount of Gold (26,28) and wood (32)). Also *IG I<sup>3</sup> 449,475,476* and *IV<sup>2</sup> 102, A1.43-67*.

<sup>28</sup> This can be seen both in the building of the Erechtheum and in the production of its sculptured decoration. For building see *IG I<sup>3</sup> 476*. For sculpture see again *IG I<sup>3</sup> 476*; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 449.395-403* and *IG I<sup>3</sup> 475*. Iasos of Kollytos for example, though a wealthy citizen sculptor (Stewart 1990.71; APF 7423) only produced “the woman and the small girl pressed against her” (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 476.176ff.*).

Individuals had to submit designs into a competition,<sup>29</sup> from which the designer was chosen by the *Boule/Ekklesia*. This means that these organs of the state had a strong influence not only over the final appearance of the monument, but also over what types of monuments were being designed,<sup>30</sup> given that it was these bodies who called for its design in the first place (cf. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 35* line 1).<sup>31</sup> They were also able to specify the materials it was to be made of (cf. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 64A*). Such a limitation of the individual is also paralleled outside Athens, where the state made an effort to limit the number of public building contracts that an individual could have at any one time.<sup>32</sup>

The notion of gaining the approval of the state permeates every level of design for all different types of monuments. Competitions were also held for the artistic decoration on these buildings, and indeed for self-standing sculptures. Paionios, under his Nike at Olympia, inscribed: “Paionios made me, he who won (*enika*) the competition to make the akroterion for the temple”.<sup>33</sup> And pseudo-Aristotle relates how it was the job of the *Boule* to judge the competition for the design of the robe for Athena’s statue – at least, that is, until they started showing favouritism, when the decision was moved to the *dikasterion*.<sup>34</sup>

In the fourth century the system of offering the design out to a competition was not always used. Sometimes the *Ekklesia* designed it themselves. In *IG II<sup>2</sup> 403* (338 BC) – the repair of the statue of Athena Nike – we learn that the Assembly, not the artist, debated for some time what the statue should look like and indeed was encouraged to do so as

---

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Pliny *NH* 34.53: a sculptors’ competition in fifth century BC to make an amazon in the temple of Artemis at Ephesos. *SEG* 46 2289: Contests in the figurative arts. Squarciapino 1943 no. 1 (Afrodisia): Competition for a statue was judged by “*boule* and the *demos*” (see also Reinach 1906.255 no.147). *SEG* 37 626 for competitive process for sculpture in Histria. See also the evidence we have for the same process in state ordered vessels (Panathenaic Amphorae) – see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6320* and Bentz 1998.

<sup>30</sup> The rapid introduction of Theseus into the art of public monuments might be an example here. See Boardman 1982; Connor 1970; Dugas 1943; Mills 1997.

<sup>31</sup> In which sense the Democratic state becomes like the Aristocratic patron: see Kurke 1991.176-82; Thucydides 6.15; Plutarch *Themistokles* 22 and Aristophanes *Knights* 1111ff.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. *IG VII 6* (Fourth century) Tegea. The decree forbids anyone to have contracts “for more than two pieces of work, either sacred or public, in any way” (lines 25-8).

<sup>33</sup> *IG VI 1568* (424BC). Moreover, Chiot sculptors Mikkiades and Achermos set up their own Nike in the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delos in honour of their victory in the mid sixth century: Scheiber 1979.20.

<sup>34</sup> Aristotle *Ath.Pol* 49.3.

proper procedure (line 8).<sup>35</sup> Hellmann 6.1.21-38 (311BC) – connecting parts of the town in Colophon via the outer walls - which chose an *architekton* to supervise the work, actually sets up a committee of 10 (line 21) to design it. In the third century, the committee approach was standard practice and often included the supervisor *architekton* as part of the design process. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 839* (221/0 BC) shows that a general and an *architekton* are joined by five layman – 2 from the Areopagus and three from the citizen body – to design a new *oinochoe* for a priest (cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 841/2*). The state, by incorporating the individuals involved in the process of production within a committee that operated in the name of the state could render individual input into the design quite invisible (although they do decide to record his presence on the decree).<sup>36</sup>

Thus the only vaguely continual presence in the production process is the *Boule* and/or the *Ekklesia*. However they too are composed of citizens who change on a regular basis. Moreover they sometimes defer their right to decide on the design. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 64A* again, though fragmentary, seems to indicate that not only the *epistatai*, but also the Athenians “in consultation with their allies” (lines 10-11) must take a part in the deciding the winning design. Thus no one body of the state can really be said to own these monuments, even though they all had a hand in their production. Indeed the decree reliefs that accompany these inscriptions seem to reflect this. On one of the building decrees at Eleusis, the relief portrays the Goddess Demeter herself as the one giving the instructions (even possibly the design?) to the personification of the deme of Eleusis.<sup>37</sup> Moreover the decree relief that accompanied *IG I<sup>3</sup> 79* (the bridge for the processional way to Eleusis) has Demeter, Kore, Triptolemus and Athena looking down on the decree.<sup>38</sup> It is to the deities that the Athenians seem to attribute the ultimate ownership of their monuments.

---

<sup>35</sup> Indeed for some monuments there is no sculptor known to be associated with its design at all (although there must have been one) – e.g. the Eponymous Heroes. See Hölscher 1998.

<sup>36</sup> See also *IG II<sup>2</sup> 682.21-4*, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1487.80-4*.

<sup>37</sup> See Mylonas 1962 fig 64. How do decree reliefs relate to their decrees: see Lawton 1995 and Scott 2003.

<sup>38</sup> Lawton 1995 catalogue no. 3.

However while the state denied any individual or small group responsibility for many of these publicly funded monuments, it could not do so for monuments that were set up by private bodies, such as honorary statues, nor indeed did it have any control over how such monuments were designed.<sup>39</sup> Instead the *Boule* was only able to control who was honoured (as it gave permission for a statue)<sup>40</sup> and where it was put.<sup>41</sup> A statue's placement (its 'social geography') was one element of its meaning over which the state had complete ownership, which it took unusual pains to record.<sup>42</sup>

The state had a large impact on the production of public monuments, not least because its constituent bodies choose the parameters for the monument and the winning design. In the fourth and third centuries the state took care of design completely "in house" through committees. In the fifth century, when individuals do seem to be responsible for the design, I have argued that the state could still ensure that such influence did not amount to ownership of a monument. Yet I have also argued that neither the bodies of the state nor individuals in reality had (or wanted to appear to have) any claim to responsibility for the monument, as is expressed in the decree reliefs, which instead attributes them to the Gods.

### **Conclusion: Building a (Monumental) Thesis.**

In trying to think about how monuments ended up looking as they did, we inevitably come to focus on the two energies that went into a monument's

---

<sup>39</sup>For honorary statues see Oliver 2003; Francotte 1900 and Gauthier 1985. This was a prevalent practice in the fourth century – see Tanner 1999.152.

<sup>40</sup> Attica: Agora XV no. 34; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1043 63-69; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 844.39-41; Peloponese: *IG V<sup>2</sup>* 156; Central and Northwest Greece: *IG VII* 2712.105; Delos: *IG XI* 514.5. Such strict control does not however apply to all areas of a city - for example, cult places on the north slope of the Acropolis in Athens were not 'policed' to the same degree – see Glowacki Forthcoming.

<sup>41</sup> It was forbidden to put one anywhere near the Tyrannicides: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 450.b7-12 and 646.37-40. Also *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1039.36ff. See Plutarch *ME* 847D, 852E. Plutarch *LX* 847d,e. Diodorus Siculus. 5.15,32.

<sup>42</sup> e.g. *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 472. It deals with the erection of a statue and goes through all details of payment to every member of team (including those who make wood frames for its transportation) although it does not (as we have it) mention the artist. See Thompson 1969.

production – the craftsmen’s and the state’s. I began this essay by suggesting that the relationship between the two, rather than being agonistic, was one of “dynamic dialogue”.<sup>43</sup> In concluding I would like to elucidate some of the ways in which this dialogue manifests itself and what the presence of such dialogue means.

Firstly there is a conflict between the impression given by the later written sources and the contemporary evidence, which offer us different ways of looking at the status of the individual and of monuments as a whole depending on whether we see monuments as Art or as part of an institutional fabric. Such well-entrenched ways of seeing fundamentally influence how we enter into our own dialogue with these monuments and with the creative processes behind them.

Secondly by using the example of the *architekton* as a starting point, we have examined how the individual and the state interact within the creative mix of the production process as shown by the epigraphic record. The dynamic dialogue between these two is extremely varied and complex. The *architekton* clearly had a supervisory role in the execution of public monuments. However he does not seem to have a primary role in design (although as a supervisor he would be called upon to make alterations on site as problems arose). On the occasions when individuals are named whose design for the project has been accepted, there is no indication in the decrees how those individuals were chosen. Indeed the decrees seem to be purposefully obscure on this point.<sup>44</sup>

As far as we can interpret how that choice was made, it seems to have been structured through a competitive process. This state led process offered an arena for the dialogue between the two to be played out. Such a process allowed the organs of government a strong hand in the design of monuments.

---

<sup>43</sup> Following recent scholars’ work on the interaction of the individual and state more generally, which is characterised as intensive negotiation and interaction between agency and social structure. See Dobres 2000.

<sup>44</sup> There could be said to be a dialogue between what was said and what was recorded. As Osborne points out for decrees in the Assembly where omissions are perhaps intended to make the documents less “volatile” and to “obscure the political issues” – Osborne 1999.341-58. Marc 1998 takes a different view that such omissions are used to emphasise political victories. It may also be that the Individual must be downplayed in the official recording of the democratic *polis*. It is after all a *team* effort – see Spivey 1996.162/3; Plutarch *LP* 12, *Moralia* 970, *LC* 5.

Yet such a strong hand for the state does not preclude the impact of the individual on the design<sup>45</sup> (or indeed preclude the high status of artists in ancient society).<sup>46</sup>

Thirdly we must consider the dialogue between individual and state as one that also has a temporal dimension. The naming of the individual as designer, and indeed the whole competitive process for design - practices of the fifth century, fade out in the fourth, and are replaced in the fourth and third centuries by one led by a committee (indeed the rider to *IG I<sup>3</sup> 35* may be seen as a good precursor for this). The committee, which functioned in the name of the Athenian state, could incorporate all the individuals involved in the process. Crucially this trend towards a more 'democratic' way of designing monuments outlives the period of 'true' democracy in Athens, as we can see from evidence for its continuation in the third century.

Such a varied recipe of interaction and dialogue only exists because neither the individual nor the state could (or wanted to) claim to 'own' the monument. No one can be said to own it, though everyone had a hand in its production. Thus the production process, by encouraging this dialectical relationship between individual and state, actually prevents these two entities from coming into conflict (and the committee procedure of the third century, by harmonising both elements, is the fullest expression of this). The existence of the dialogue and the absence of the monopolisation by one side or the other means that we cannot think of monuments as being showcases for individuals or part of a structured, well rehearsed, totally state dominated propaganda campaign. Instead it is the presence of the dynamic dialogue between individual and state - the presence of the people - within the production process that makes these monuments part of Athenian public identity.

---

<sup>45</sup> As Viviers puts it: "les artistes ont fait l'histoire en ce sens qu'ils auraient traduit une forme de pensée et une organisation sociale particulières." 1989.33.

<sup>46</sup> See Tanner 1999. Sculptors could be the symbol of a political group or ideology – Diodorus Siculus 12.39.1 and Plutarch *LP* 31. Some craftsmen had important social positions. Ephesus granted full citizenship to two Athenian potters Bakckios and Kittos - see Preuner 1920.69-72. Philon of Eleusis, an architect of the mid 4<sup>th</sup> century arsenal, also took up a trierarchy in 340 BC (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1622.694*). Delphi makes an architect a citizen (Hellmann 24). Epikrates honoured by Istros as architect (Hellmann 25).

Yet as should be clear from some of the epigraphic evidence that I have used, it was not only in Athens that this dialogue between individual and state in the production of monuments was taking place.<sup>47</sup> To a great extent the processes we have described for how the Athenians built their monuments are paralleled across a large part of the Hellenic world. Other states tendered out design in a competition for example. Yet it was perhaps the acute focus on Athens as a cultural and imperial centre that made the way Athens did things, and the way Athenians perceived that they did things, more important. Thus, in the final analysis, it was perhaps Athens' ability to recognise and confront (to enter into dialogue with) the relationship of individual and state inherent in its public monuments, which was fundamental to the formation of its (unique) political identity.

---

<sup>47</sup> Indeed Athens should be considered less unique than previously thought - see Boedeker and Raaflaub 1998.

# INDIVIDUAL AND STATE IN THE PRODUCTION OF ATHENIAN PUBLIC MONUMENTS

## *Bibliography*

- Austin R.P.  
1931 "A note on Temple Equipment" *JHS* 51 289
- Bernard A.  
1972 *De Koptos a Kosseir*, Leiden
- Bentz M.  
1998 *Panathenäische Preisamphoren - Eine athenische Vasengattung und ihre Funktion vom 6 - 4 Jh. V.Chr.*, Basel
- Benndorf O.  
1902 "Antike Baumodelle" *JOEAI* 5 175-97
- Berenson B.  
1954 *Aesthetics and History*, New York
- Blanshard A.  
Forthcoming "Depicting Democracy"
- Boardman J.  
1982 "Herakles, Theseus and the Amazons" in *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens* Kurtz D. and Sparkes B. (Eds.), Cambridge 1-28
- 1985 "Image and Politics in Sixth Century Athens" in *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery* Brijder H.A.G (Ed.), Proceedings of the International Vase symposium, Amsterdam 239-247
- Boedeker D.  
Raaflaub K. (Eds.)  
1998 *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Boersma J.S.  
1970 *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0-405/4 BC*, Scripta Archaeologica Groningana 4, Groningen

- Bundgård J.A.  
1957 *Mnesicles: An Architect at Work*, Copenhagen
- 1976 *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City in the Heights*, Copenhagen
- Burford A.  
1969 *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidaurus*, Liverpool
- 1972 *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman society*, London
- Castriota D.  
1992 *Myth, Ethos and Actuality: Official Art in 5<sup>th</sup> century BC Athens*, Madison
- Choisy A.  
1884 *Etudes epigraphiques sur l'architecture grecque*, Paris
- Cook R.M.  
1987 "Pots and Pisistratan Propaganda" *JHS* 107 42-47
- Connor W.R.  
1970 "Theseus in Classical Athens" in *The Quest for Theseus* Ward A. (Ed.) 143-174
- Crowther N.  
1985 "Male beauty contests in Greece: the euandria and the euexia" *AC* 54 285-91
- 1991 "Euexia, Eutaxia, Philoponia: Three contests of the Greek Gynasium" *ZPE* 85 301-04
- Coulton J.J.  
1977 *Greek Architects at Work*, London
- 1983 "Greek Architects and the Transmission of Design" in *Architecture et Société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la république Romaine*, Gros P. (Ed.) Collections de L'Ecole Francaise de Rome 453-470
- Daveste M.R.  
1877 *Mémoire sur les entreprises de travaux publics chez les Grecs*, Annuaire de l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France
- Donnay G.  
Verbanck-Piérard A.  
(Eds.)  
1981 "Art et Politique à Athènes de Solon à Démétrios de Phalère" *Annales d'Histoire de L'Art et l'Archaeologie* 3 17-45

- Dobres M.A.  
2000 *Technology and Social agency: outlining a practice framework for archaeology*, Oxford
- Dörpfeld W.  
1904 Der ursprüngliche Plan des Erechtheions, *AM* 29 101-7
- Dugas C.  
1943 “L’évolution de la légende de Thésée” *REG* 56 1-23
- Francotte H.  
1900 *De la législation Athénienne sur les distinctions honorifiques*, Musée Belge, 3-4, Louvain
- Gauthier Ph.  
1985 *Les cites grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, BCH Supplement XII, Paris
- de la Genière J.  
1999 “Quelques reflexions sur les clients de la céramique attique” in *Céramique et Peinture Grecques Modes D’emploi*, Villanueva M, Lissarrague F., Rouillard P., Rouvert A. (Eds.) Paris, 411-25
- Glowacki K.  
2004 *Sanctuaries and Cults on the North Side of the Acropolis*, Forthcoming
- Gros P. (Ed.)  
1983 *Architecture et Société de l’archaïsme grec à la fin de la république Romaine*, Collections de L’Ecole Française de Rome
- Haynes D.  
1992 *The Technique of Greek Bronze Statuary*, Mainz
- Hellmann M.C.  
1999 *Choix d’inscriptions architecturales grecques*, Lyon

- Hölscher T.  
1973 *Griechische Historienbilder des 5u4 Jhr v Chr*, Munich
- 1991 “The City of Athens: Space, Symbol, Structure” in *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, Molho. A, Raafalub K., Emler J. (Eds.), Stuttgart
- 1998 “Images of Political Identity: The case of Athens” in *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens*, Boedeker D. and Raaflaub K. (Eds.), Cambridge, Mass. 153-184
- Kallet L.  
1998 “Accounting for culture in Fifth Century Athens” in *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens*, Boedeker D. and Raaflaub K. (Eds.), Cambridge Mass. 43-58
- Keuls E.  
1978 *Plato and Greek Painting*, Leiden
- Kurke L.  
1991 *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca, NY
- Lauter H.  
1974 *Zur Gesellschaftlichen Stellung des bildenden Künstlers in der griechischen Klassik*, Erlanger
- Lawton C.L.  
1995 *Attic Document Reliefs*, Oxford
- Levêque P.  
Vidal-Naquet P. (Eds.)  
1961 *Clisthène L’Athénien*, Paris
- Lloyd G.  
1990 *Demystifying Mentalities*, Cambridge
- Loewy E.  
1885 *Inscriben griechischer Bildhauer*, Leipzig
- Mark I.S.  
1993 “Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural stages and Chronology” *Hesperia* Supplement 26
- Marc J.Y.  
1998 “Les en-têtes de decrets à relief à Athènes: entre consecration privée et pratique publique” *Ktema* 29 145-152

- Marcadé J.  
1953 *Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs,*
- Martin R.  
1983 “L’espace civique, religieux et profane dans les cités grecques de l’archaïsme à l’époque Romaine” (8-41) and “Intervention” (450-452) in Gros (1983)
- Mattingly H.  
1982 “The Athenian Nike Temple Reconsidered” *AJA* 86 381-85
- Mattusch C.C  
1975 *Casting Techniques of Greek Bronze sculptors: foundries and foundry remains from the Athenian agora with reference to other ancient sources,* Ann Arbor
- 1980 “The Berlin Foundry Cup” *AJA* 84 440-441
- 1994 “The Eponymous Heroes: The idea of Sculptural Groups” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* Coulson W. and Palagia O. (Eds) 73-81
- Meiggs R.  
Lewis D.M.  
1969 *Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century,* Oxford
- Métraux G.  
1995 *Sculptors and Physicians in Fifth Century Greece: a preliminary study,* Montreal
- Mills S.  
1997 *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire,* Oxford
- Moreland J.  
2003 *Archaeology and Text,* London
- Morris I.  
1994 *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies,* Cambridge
- Mylonas G.E.  
1962 *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries,* London
- Neils J.  
1994 “The Panathenaia and Kleisthenic Ideology” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* Coulson W. and Palagia O. (Eds.) Oxford 151-60

- Oliver G.  
2003 *Controlling Word, Image and Space: statues and state decrees in the Athenian Agora*, Conference in Honour of Harold Mattingly: "Words on Things", Cambridge University
- Osborne C.  
1987 "The repudiation of representation in Plato's Republic and its repercussions" *PCPS* 33 53-73
- Osborne R.  
1998 *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*, Oxford
- 1999 "Inscribing Performance" in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Goldhill S. and Osborne R. (Eds), Cambridge, 341-358
- Panofsky E.  
1970 *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Harmondsworth
- Phillipp H.  
1963 *Tektonon daidala: Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk in vorplatonischen Schriftum*, Berlin
- 1990 "Handwerker und bildende Künstler in der griechischen Gesellschaft, vom Homerischen Zeit bis zum Ende des 5 Jhr. v.Chr" in *Polyklet: der Buildhauer der griechischen Klassik* Beck H., Pol P.C. (Eds.) Mainz 79-110
- Pollitt J.J  
1972 *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*, Cambridge
- 1974 *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History and Terminology*, New Haven CY and London
- 1990 *The Art of Ancient Greece – Sources and Documents*, Cambridge
- Preuner E.  
1920 "Archäologisch - Epigraphisches" *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Archäolog Instituts* 30, 59-96
- Reinach T.  
1906 "Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias" *Revue des études grecques*, 19 201-98
- Rhodes P.J.  
1972 *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford Clarendon Press
- Richter G.M.A  
1950 *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, New Haven

- Ridgway B.  
1974 "A story of Five Amazons" *AJA* 78 1-17
- 1997 *Fourth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*, Madison
- Rolleg C.  
1983 "L'artiste et le citoyen: réflexions sur l'art grec archaïque"  
*Memoires de l'Académie des Sciences, Arts et Belles Lettres de Dijon* CXXVI 323-31
- Scheibler E.  
1979 "Griechischer Künstlervotive der archaischen Zeit" in  
*Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 30 7-25
- Schuller W.  
1997 "Zur Bauplanung der athenischen demokratie des 5  
Jahrhunderts" in *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Acropolis*  
Hoepfner W. (Ed.) 184-194
- Schweitzer B.  
1925 "Der bildende Künstler und der Begriff des Künstlerischen in  
der Antike" *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 2 28-132
- 1932 "Xenocrates von Athen" *Schriften der Königsberger  
Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* 9,  
1-52
- Scott M.  
2003 "Demos and Demokratia in Athenian Art", *Cambridge  
University Undergraduate Dissertation*
- Shapiro A.  
1989 *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz
- Shear I.M.  
1963 "Kallikrates" *Hesperia* 32 408-24
- Shear T.L.  
1966 *Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building  
Program*, Princeton
- Sparkes B.  
2003 *Craftsmen in View*, Cambridge  
Classical Association Lecture
- Spivey N.  
1996 *Understanding Greek Sculpture: Ancient Meanings, Modern  
Readings*, London

- Squarciapino M.  
1943 *La scuola di Afrodisia*, Rome
- Stähler K.  
1992 *Griechische Geschichtsbilder Klassischer Zeit*, Münster,  
1993 *Form und Funktion Kunstwerke als politischen  
Ausdrucksmittel*, Münster Ugarit Verlag
- Steiner D.  
1998 “Moving images: fifth century victory monuments and the  
athlete’s allure” *CA* 17 123-49
- Stewart A.  
1979 *Attika: studies in Athenian sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*,  
London  
1990 *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration* New Haven
- Stupperich R.  
1994 “The iconography of Athenian State Burials in the Classical  
Period” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the  
Democracy*, Coulson W. and Palagia O. (Eds.) Oxford, 93-  
103
- Tanner J.  
1992 “Art as expressive symbolism: civic portraits in classical  
Athens” *CAJ* 2 167-90  
1999 “Culture, Social Structure and the Visual Arts in Classical  
Greece” *PCPS* 45 135-75  
2000 “Social Structure: cultural rationalism and aesthetic  
judgement in classical Greece” in *Word and Image in Ancient  
Greece*, Rutter K. and Sparkes B. (Eds.), Edinburgh  
University Press 183-205
- Thompson H.A  
1964 “A note on the Berlin Foundry Cup” in *Essays in memory of  
Karl Lehmann*, Marysas Supplement 1 325  
1969 “The Inscriptions in the Hephaisteion” *Hesperia* 38  
114-118
- Viviers D.  
1989 *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cite d’Athènes  
à l’époque archaïque*, Brussels
- Voitgländer W.  
1975 *Der Jüngste Apollontempel von Didyma*, Tübingen

- Wasowicz A.  
1983 “Le programme urbain de la polis grecque” in Gros (1983)  
87-91
- Webster T.B.L.  
1972 *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens*, London
- Welch E.  
1997 *Art and Society in Italy 1350-1500*, Oxford
- Weller C.H.  
1921 “The Original Plan of the Erechtheum” *AJA* 25 130-141
- Wycherley R.E.  
1957 *The Athenian Agora – Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*  
Vol III, American School of Classical Studies at Athens,  
Princeton
- Zanker P.  
1988 *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor